

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/909,396	FUKUDA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John P. Sheehan	1742	

All Participants:

(1) John P. Sheehan.

(2) Mr. Mark Kendrick.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 8 March 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none

Claims discussed:
none

Prior art documents discussed:
none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner pointed out that the Transmittal Of Information Disclosure Statement for the IDS submitted November 3, 2003 refers to an attached Taiwanese Patent Office communication, however the Examiner could not find such a document nor was such a document cited on the list of references included in the IDS. Mr. Kendrick indicated that the Transmittal Of Information Disclosure Statement was erroneous. .